

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

HEATHER HERNDON,

Plaintiff,

v.

EXPERIAN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-00165-SLG

**ORDER RE THIRD DEMAND AMENDED FOR REASSIGNMENT OF JUDGE**

Before the Court are Plaintiff Heather Herndon's "Third Demand for Reassignment of Judge" at Docket 58 and "Third Demand Amended for Reassignment of Judge" at Docket 59.<sup>1</sup> Ms. Herndon's amended demand at Docket 59 appears to be identical to her demand at Docket 58 apart from identifying herself as a "vessel" in the amended filing in the caption of the case. Defendant Experian Information Solutions, Inc. did not file a response to either motion.<sup>2</sup>

Ms. Herndon takes issue with several of the Court's rulings, including the Court's denial of Ms. Herndon's Motion for Summary Judgment and the Court's

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Ms. Herndon has captioned these filings as demands, the Court will treat them as motions.

<sup>2</sup> Ms. Herndon has also filed a motion for a permanent injunction, which will be addressed in a separate order. See Docket 55,

“granting Defendant two extensions to Plaintiff’s expressed objections.”<sup>3</sup> However, disagreements with “judicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion,” and the Court does not find reassignment necessary or appropriate in this case.<sup>4</sup>

In addition, as the Court stated in its order on April 20, 2023 (Docket 49), Ms. Herndon is once more cautioned that all Court filings requesting that the Court enter an order must be in the form of a motion, with an appropriate caption designating the name of the motion. And for all but dispositive motions, the moving party is required to file with the motion a proposed order setting forth the relief that the party is seeking.<sup>5</sup> “Notices” and “Demands” are not motions, and the Court may not take any action on future filings that are not substantially in compliance with the local rules.

For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s “Third Demand for Reassignment of Judge” at Docket 58 and “Third Demand Amended for Reassignment of Judge” at Docket 59 are DENIED.

DATED this 8th day of June, 2023, at Anchorage, Alaska.

/s/ Sharon L. Gleason  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>3</sup> Docket 59 at 1.

<sup>4</sup> *In re Focus Media, Inc.*, 378 F.3d 916, 930 (9th Cir. 2004), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 109-8, 119 Stat. 23 (2005), *as recognized in Dep’t of Revenue v. Blixseth*, 942 F.3d 1179, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2019).

<sup>5</sup> See Alaska L. Civ. R. 7.1(b).